

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this amendment, Claims 1, 7-9, 12, and 20-22 have been amended. Claims 2-3 have been cancelled. Hence, Claims 1 and 4-23 are pending in the application.

THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

Claims 1 - 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,781,608 to Crawford. The rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Currently Amended Claim 1 recites:

A method for sharing data in a messaging environment, comprising:

transferring a first search result for a search, based on a particular set of search terms, from a first application on a first client to a first instant messaging environment on the first client;

in response to user input received by the first instant messaging environment:

transferring search data associated with the search over a network to a second instant messaging environment on a second client; and

causing a control to be presented in the second instant messaging environment on the second client;

in response to user selection of the control presented in the second instant messaging environment:

transferring said search data from said second instant messaging environment on the second client to a second application on said second client;

transferring a second search result from said second application to said second instant messaging environment; and

providing, in the second instant messaging environment, said second search result based on the search data, wherein the second search result reflects a search that was performed based said particular set of search terms.

Crawford fails to teach or suggest the above limitations. For example, consider if a first user at a first client and a second user at a second client were carrying on a conversation via respective first and second instant messaging environments. Even if the first user were to send a search term as a text message to a second user such that the second user received the search term in the second instant messaging environment, and the second user were to copy the search term to a web browser on the second client, the above limitations would not be taught.

First, receiving a search term as a text message in an instant messaging environment is not a control presented in an instant messaging system. That is, a text message presented in an instant messaging environment cannot be used as a control, as claimed. The following discussion of steps that are performed in response to user selection of the control presented in the instant messaging environment clearly illustrate that a text message cannot be the claimed control.

Claim 1 recites that a series of steps are performed in response to selection of the control. Crawford does not teach or suggest such steps. For example, Crawford does not teach that search data is transferred from said second instant messaging environment on the second client to a second application on said second client, as claimed. Referring again to the example in which two users are engaged in an instant messaging conversation, according to the reasoning of the rejection, the second user would apparently need to manually transfer the text search term from the second instant message environment to a second application on the second client in order for a search to be performed at the second client.

Moreover, Claim 1 also recites, in response to user selection of the control presented in the second instant messaging environment, transferring a second search result from said second application to said second instant messaging environment, and providing, in the second instant

messaging environment, said second search result based on the search data. There is no teaching or suggestion in Crawford of search results being transferred and provided to the second instant messaging environment, in response to user selection of the control presented in the second instant messaging environment.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Crawford.

Claims 21 and 22 comprise similar limitations to those discussed in the response to Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 21 and 22 are allowable.

The dependent claims are allowable at least based on their dependence from Claim 1. The dependent claims comprise addition limitations that further distinguish over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Date: August 1, 2006

Ronald M. Pomerenke
Reg. No. 43,009

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
Telephone: (408) 414-1080
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on Aug 1, 2006 by Trudy Bagdon
Trudy Bagdon